[18th August 1925

A.—Oriya translations are published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* whenever Government think it necessary. The Government decide in each case whether a Bill should be translated into any of the vernaculars.

Minor Irrigation.

Minor irrigation works in Bellary district.

* 10 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to
11-45 a.m. ascertain and state—

(*a*) the number of minor irrigation works in each taluk of the Bellary district—

(i) in charge of the Public Works Department, and

(ii) in charge of the Revenue Department;

(*b*) the expenditure incurred in 1923–24 on the repairs thereof;

(*c*) the number of works in each taluk of the district, or, if that information cannot easily be furnished, in the district as a whole selected for repairs in 1924–25 and the amount allotted for them; and

(*d*) the number of works still in need of repair and the probable cost thereof?

A.—(*a*) (i) Hospet 19; Kudligi 38; Hadagalli 6; Harpanahalli 14; Siruguppa 4; Adoni 5; Rayadrug 12.

(ii) Three hundred for the whole district; particulars by taluks are not available.

(*b*) Rupees 77,244.

(*c*) One hundred and forty works; Rs. 37,700.

(*d*) Figures are not available.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"In view of the fact that enough amount has not been allotted for the current year, will the Government be pleased to allot a larger amount?"

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks:—"I do not follow the hon. Member."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"The allotment for the year 1923–24 was Rs. 77,000 and for the year 1924–25 it was Rs. 37,000. So, the amount that would be really needed will be much more but only a very small amount has been allotted. I wish to know therefore if a larger provision is going to be made."

The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks:—"I understand that allotment in the current year is small owing to the fact that a tank restoration party has been working in the district. We shall endeavour to make as large a provision as possible in the next year."

Panchayat Courts.

Elections to the Village Panchayat Court, Tiruppattur.

* 11 *Q.*—Mr. R. Veerian: With reference to question No. 557 answered on 20th March 1925 regarding the election of members to the Village Panchayat Court, Tiruppattur, held at Tiruppattur Taluk office, will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the information has been called for; and

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

(b) if so, whether the Government will lay the same on the table of this Council?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The following is a copy of the letter received from the District Magistrate, North Arcot, in regard to question No. 557 referred to :—

From the Collector of North Arcot, L. Dis. No. 3106-25, dated the 16th March 1925.

[Legislative Council—Question No. 557—Panchayat Court—Tiruppattur—Answered—Your Memorandum No. 1124-B-1, dated 6th March 1925.]

The answers to Mr. Veerian's questions are—

(a) Yes.

(b) No.

The officer who was then Tahsildar has since been transferred but enquiries made by the Sub-Collector and the present Tahsildar show that the then Tahsildar did not exclude Adi-Dravidas from the Taluk office. What apparently happened is that the Adi-Dravidas arrived in a body at the Taluk office to find it already full of Hindus and Muhammadans. The most prominent Adi-Dravida and two of his followers went inside the office while the rest of the Adi-Dravidas remained on the verandah, as there was not room inside, together probably with some Hindus and Muhammadans. None of the Adi-Dravidas who were present at the election and examined by the Sub-Collector asserts that the Tahsildar excluded Adi-Dravidas because they were Adi-Dravidas. I may add that Mr. Veerian's informant, who was also examined by the Sub-Collector, was not present at the election himself but says that he heard these things afterwards. An article in the *Deenabandhu* of the 27th December last contributed by an Adi-Dravida describing the election makes no mention of the suggestion that the Adi-Dravidas were excluded.

(c) No. It does not appear that there was any failure on the part of the Tahsildar to conduct the counting of votes properly. Mr. Muniswami Pillai, who as a municipal councillor and member of the taluk and district boards, is a leader of Adi-Dravida community, and was present at the election and went inside the hall, deposed that he watched the proceedings carefully and that the failure of the Adi-Dravida candidate was not due to any irregularity in counting the votes but to the fact that his candidature was not supported by any members of other communities.

Mr. R. Veerian :—" From the answers given by Government I understand that the Tahsildar has been transferred to some other place. May I know whether the Tahsildar was transferred by the Collector because he gave room for the present complaint? "

The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar :—" I am not aware, Sir."